

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 18-19, 21, 26, 28, 33-38, 44-47, and 51-52 are pending. The Office Action rejects Claims 1-3, 18-19, 21, 26, 28, 33-38, 44-47, and 51-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,314,095 to Loa (“Loa”) in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0126675 to Yoshimura et al. (“Yoshimura”). In light of the subsequent remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

The Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 33, and 44 under §103(a) is Overcome

The Office Action submits that independent Claims 1, 33, and 44 (“the independent claims”) are unpatentable over the combination of Loa and Yoshimura. Independent Claim 1 is directed to a method comprising receiving a data packet at an input interface. The received data packet comprises a header section and a pay-load section. The header section comprises a compressed header section containing coded information including routing information. The method additionally comprises decompressing said routing information from said compressed header section. The method also comprises including at least a part of said decompressed routing information into said data packet. The method further comprises routing said data packet to an output interface. The method additionally comprises forwarding said data packet to said output interface, wherein said routing comprises ascertaining said routing information from said compressed header section, and wherein said coded information is left unchanged by said routing and forwarding. Independent Claims 33 and 44 are directed to apparatuses and though they have their own respective scopes, include substantially similar features as Claim 1 insofar as this discussion is concerned.

The Office Action admits that Loa fails to teach or suggest decompressing routing information included in a header section of a received data packet and including at least a part of the decompressed routing information into the data packet. The Office Action instead relies on Yoshimura. However, Yoshimura fails to cure the deficiencies of Loa.

Briefly, Yoshimura is directed to a packet transmission method for transmitting packets according to a quality of service requirement. In this regard, Yoshimura teaches dividing packets into a plurality of shorter data units so that real-time packets may be transmitted according to quality of service requirements even during transmission of a large data type IP packet. *See*, paragraphs 88 and 89 of Yoshimura.

The Office Action alleges that the portion of Yoshimura discussing transmission of compressed headers in divided data units and decompressing and reassembling the divided data units at a receiver cures the deficiencies of Loa. Applicants, however, respectfully disagree. In this regard, Yoshimura teaches in paragraphs 77-80 that a data packet with a compressed header is divided into data units and the data units carry an indication of whether retransmissions are used. This information is not routing information, as the independent claims require. Further, Yoshimura does not teach or suggest decompressing routing information included in a compressed header section, as recited by the independent claims. Accordingly, Yoshimura does not teach or suggest including at least a part of the decompressed routing information into the data packet. Moreover, the divided data units taught by Yoshimura do not themselves carry a compressed header. Only the reassembled data packet as a whole does.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Yoshimura does not cure the deficiencies of Loa admitted by the office. Moreover, none of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies of Loa and Yoshimura. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 33, and 44 are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, such that the rejection is overcome and further submit that Claims 1, 33, and 44 are in condition for allowance.

The Rejection of the Dependent Claims is Overcome

Because each of the dependent claims includes each of the recitations of a respective independent base claim, Applicants further submit that the dependent claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, for at least those reasons discussed above. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit

Appl. No.: 10/529,195

Response dated February 15, 2010

Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2009

that the rejections of the dependent claims are overcome and the dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the present claims of the present application are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Leyes
Registration No. 61,317

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON February 15, 2010.**